

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXVI (67th Year) No. 144

NOVEMBER, 1952

EDITORIAL

IT was during the reign of the first Elizabeth that Francis Bacon claimed to ring a "bell" calling other wits together. We believe the second Elizabethan Age will mark a new phase in the development of the Francis Bacon Society. We therefore begin, as no doubt he would have done, by tendering our homage and devotion to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

* * * *

In this issue of BACONIANA will be found a most interesting and refreshing contribution by Mr. Manly Palmer Hall, the well-known American author which, by his kind permission and coupled with a message of goodwill to our society, is reprinted from his recent publication "The Adepts." It shows how Francis Bacon laid "Great Bases for Eternity" on both sides of the Atlantic—a fact which is far too often forgotten. Our American brethren have often taken the lead in calling attention to this fact and keeping alive the Baconian tradition and we feel that closer co-operation with them will be mutually helpful.

"Good Queen Bess"—of immortal memory—ascended the throne at a time of national crisis. Protestantism and Papacy were still contending within the realm and religious intolerance of a most iniquitous kind threatened from without. The firm stand taken by our ancestors secured and guarded the gestation period of a New Age. That age, dimly foreshadowed in Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Campanella's *City of the Sun*, and Bacon's *New Atlantis*, is still unborn. Before the birth can be accomplished, before Europe can be delivered of her child, it is not impossible that we too may be called upon to make a stand, although this time it may be as much mental as physical.

Totalitarian ideologies, like the rankest weeds, are growing apace. In many parts of the world, ideological jargon, doctored news and distorted history, are constantly "on the air." The true meaning of words is frequently perverted. Democracies are assailed in the name of "democracy," and even on the international plane, black proclaims itself white.

These "Idols of the Theatre", as Francis Bacon called them, have now reached a gigantic stature. Amongst them grow the lesser weeds—"The Idols of the Market", which was his name for the wrong use of words, whether accidental or deliberate. Modern science has saddled mankind with the responsibilities of power, and power is often controlled by words. It is therefore most necessary, in the critical years

ahead, that these Idols should be recognised, and that black should be known for black and white for white.

* * * *

A serious misconception as to the nature of Bacon's teaching requires to be put right. Both he and his "collaborators" (if we dare use the word in its proper sense!) have been rightly credited with sowing seeds from which a true scientific knowledge, founded on experience and verifiable facts, could begin to grow; yet a modern writer on Shakespeare,¹ amidst much that is excellent, has gone to the extreme of blaming Bacon for what he calls "the split between morality and science." This is so wide of the mark that we shall only need to quote Bacon's own words on this very point.

"Wherefore seeing that knowledge is of the number of those things which are to be accepted with caution and distinction; being now to open a fountain, such as it is not easy to discern where the issues and streams thereof will take and fall; I thought it good and necessary in the first place to make a strong and sound head or bank to rule and guide the course of the waters; by setting down this position or firmament, namely—that *all knowledge is to be limited by religion, and to be referred to use and action.*"

Bacon himself, as one of our members pointed out at the discussion meeting in June, foresaw many technical triumphs of modern science, including such things as explosives, aeroplanes, and submarines; but again and again he warns us of the dangers if material scientific knowledge becomes an end in itself. It is impossible to separate Bacon's scientific aims from his religious faith. The *Advancement of Learning* is almost a continual prayer:

"this also we humbly beg, that human things may not prejudice such as are Divine; neither that from the unlocking of the gates of sense, and the kindling of a greater natural light, anything of Incredulity or *Intellectual Night* may arise in our minds towards *divine mysteries*".

* * * *

Turning to matters less exalted, we feel that the Francis Bacon Society, like the nation itself, is facing a grave testing time. This test is imposed by the Law of Economy, a law which may not be disregarded entirely, even in the interests of good will and high cause. The administration of the Society and the Editorship of *BACONIANA* are now on a completely voluntary basis, but some expenditure on rent, printing and secretarial work, will obviously be necessary. We therefore beg all who have the interests of Francis Bacon at heart to remember that the future of this society depends on an increase of membership and of income, if the work in which we believe is to be carried on at an economic level.

Immediate conversion of the world to our views can hardly be expected; but no movement such as ours could survive sixty-seven

¹Theodore Spencer, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*

years and two world wars, unless the Truth were in it. A part of this truth, known to Baconians, has already been on the point of public revelation on more than one occasion, but always unseen hands seem to have checked the proceedings at a critical juncture. The Spenser and Shakespeare memorials in Westminster Abbey, the Bruton vault in Virginia, the monument of Francis Bacon and the tomb of his friend Sir Thomas Meautys in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, and even the curious effigy at Stratford, have never, to our knowledge, been exhaustively explored.

It is natural to assume that all such opposition has arisen from vested interests. Yet is this certain? What if the time is still not ripe? Surely this would be in accordance with the designs of one who wrote the words, "Ripeness is All."

* * * *

A recent announcement by Mr. Calvin Hoffman, in the *Times* of September 22nd, promises newly discovered evidence that Christopher Marlowe may have lived on for an unknown number of years after his recorded death in a tavern brawl at Deptford. Such evidence alone would not surprise us very much, since many Baconians hold that Marlowe was an early mask of Francis Bacon and that, for reasons probably connected with his unreliable behaviour, he had to be dropped in favour of the actor Shaksper who, being illiterate, was less likely to cause trouble.

Mr. Hoffman goes further, however, and (although he does not yet promise external evidence upon this point), affirms his belief that Marlowe was the real author of the Shakespeare Plays as well as of the plays usually ascribed to him. In a word he believes that Shakespeare was Marlowe's mask.

There has of course always been a Marlowe mystery. If we can bring ourselves to accept the very scanty evidence of his authorship, he is undoubtedly the greatest English dramatic poet prior to Shakespeare. On the other hand only one of the works attributed to him, the play called "Tamburlaine", was published during his recorded lifetime and this appeared anonymously.

Thus apart from his posthumous reputation and the enigmatical remarks of Gabriel Harvey and George Chapman, there is at present very little external evidence of Marlowe's authorship of any play. It will therefore be interesting to see what new light Mr. Hoffman is able to throw on this question. His announcement informs us that he bases his theory "principally on internal evidence of similarities of style and substance" between the plays of Shakespeare and the "acknowledged" works of Marlowe. What then can, with any certainty, be regarded as the "acknowledged" works of Marlowe?

Under the Baconian hypothesis Marlowe and Shakespeare are usually regarded as successive masks of Francis Bacon and the undoubted similarities of the plays attributed to them are thereby accounted for. On the other hand when internal evidence is quite unsupported by external evidence it is seriously weakened. To quote it by itself is to beg the whole question of authorship.

Now in the case of the Earl of Oxford, another claimant, we do have some external facts on which to build; but his death in 1604 would preclude him from having any share in the vast additions and improvements which appeared in 1623 in the First Folio.

The case for Bacon, on the other hand, is much stronger. Not only did he live until after the publication of the First Folio but he has also left us a wealth of external evidence in his own books and autograph letters. He has even left a private note-book of phrases and turns of speech, many of which occur in the plays.

To have achieved so much in a single lifetime is indeed something of a miracle; but which, after all, is the greater miracle? That an acknowledged genius with all the necessary background and training from childhood, both in England and France, should perform this feat, or that it should have been performed by a man of rustic origin like William Shaks-per of whom there is no educational record, no external literary evidence and who is known to have ended his days as a money lender? Marlowe, on the other hand, was certainly an educated man who had studied at Cambridge and his claims make a lesser demand on our credulity. Still it is very difficult to believe that he could have written any of the more mature works of Shakespeare which, enclosed within an imagined dramatic world, incorporate so much of the philosophy of Francis Bacon. To the student of history, just as to the student of philosophy it is more likely that Bacon was the Master and Marlowe the mask than vice versa. Therefore until factual evidence of Marlowe's authorship is brought to light, we are content to regard his exile in France as fitting the Baconian hypothesis just as well as his recorded death on June 1st, 1593.

We have to record, with regret, that the substance of the above comments on Marlowe was sent to *The Times*, but was not printed.

* * * *

That conventional ideas on the authorship of the Shakespeare plays are slowly breaking up, however, has no doubt been noticed by most of our readers, and we make no apology for referring to the many further references to the problem which have appeared in the daily Press, and various periodicals. The Press, if it is to keep alive, must reflect public taste, and we have no doubt that the examples we quote below are important in their cumulative significance and effect.

We are grateful to a lady member for drawing our attention to an article which appeared in the *Sphere* last June, written by John Gore, who appears to have more than a nodding acquaintance with legal procedure. This writer begins by saying that the details of Shakespeare's life are "almost a hundred per cent guesswork"! Although "not a Baconian" he goes on to assert that "the Birthplace", Ann Hathaway's cottage, and "the relics" are all put out of count, and both the fifty page *Dictionary of National Biographies* and Sir Sidney Lee biographies are dismissed, with the comment that "not ten per cent of the facts recorded" in the latter "could possibly be accepted as proved by evidence acceptable in a Petty Sessional Court." Mr.

Gore, to his great credit, then says "But the hunt that matters, the hunt for *truth*, must and will go on," and then "what a mass of junk, rumour, legend, forgery and downright fabrication would be cleared away!" "Truth is the daughter of Time."

* * * *

Mention has been made before of Mr. Eric Webb's fine work for the Society in the North, and we are indebted to him for challenging immediately an article in the *Manchester Evening News*, which appeared in June. We print his reply in full below, as it gives a very good idea of the almost unbelievable number of inaccuracies and false assumptions that are presented to the public by the orthodox school as facts.

Letter to the Editor

July 8th, 1952

I must protest against the inaccuracies and pure assumptions contained in the recent article "The Glory of the Word," on Shakespeare.

There are no less than eighteen of these and six of them are contained in the first section of paragraphs. The writer cements these together with words like "would have" and "perhaps" and the continued use of the question-begging conditional tense.

But for sheer bad manners his implied insult to Baconians in the penultimate section passes all bounds of decency and is, as one would expect, inaccurate—for many well-known Baconians have inspected the 1623 Folio at the Memorial Library, Birmingham, as I can avouch. More to the point, how many Stratfordians can claim that they use facsimiles of the Folio text in preference to any other?

Readers will note that he gives the game away completely with his statement that everything ("all the rest") at Stratford apart from the "begging letter"¹ is "as bogus as an olde worlde tea-shop." Exactly. His mention of Professor Ivor Brown recalls to mind that the work "Amazing Monument" was an astonishing expose of the fraud and chicanery that still awaits the unwary visitor to Stratford to-day.

Here are some of the inaccuracies I noticed:

It is pure assumption that Will Shaksper of Stratford was "Shakespeare."

It cannot be shown that Will Shaksper attended the Stratford Grammar School. His name was not recorded.

He was not recognised as a Poet, nor as a Playwright, by anyone in Stratford. When he died, no one lamented his passing nor recorded that a great poet has passed away.

There is no contemporary record that he was "liked" or "esteemed." On the other hand, there are records of many people he sued for debt and sent to jail.

We have not one scrap of writing from his pen, therefore there can be no personal record that he "had no illusions." The quotation² belongs to "Shakespeare" not Shaksper.

We do not know that the Stratford Man hoped for a "grave and a bust" in the local church, and in any case the present bust is not the original one. The original bust shows a tradesman hugging a

¹A reference to a letter from Shaksper's daughter's father-in-law who was seeking to borrow £30.

²"thrilling regions of thick-ribbed ice."

sack of corn to his stomach. The cushion and pen are later additions and alterations.

The "determined legend" dates from the eighteenth century at the earliest and the truth is that Shaksper was twelve when his father bought the reputed "birthplace."

The "only relic" is a letter from Richard Quiney asking for a loan of £30, but the author omits to mention that it is only one letter out of four which mention the Stratford Man (all concerned with money) and that one of the other three is by Quiney Senior warning his son to bring the money back to Stratford. This bears out the true character of the man who could sue people for debt for as little as 10d.

There is no evidence that Will Shaksper studied the "box-office" receipts, but it does gain credence when we know that he owned a fifth share in the Globe Theatre.

There is no contemporary evidence that Shaksper died at New Place. There is no record of his funeral nor of the people who attended it.

The Shakespeare Memorial Library at Birmingham might be devoted to "Shake-speare," but on its shelves must be many volumes devoted to Francis Bacon, the true Author.

The 1623 Folio was certainly published seven years after Shaksper's death in 1616, but the real author was alive, since topical allusions and additions to the tune of 10,500 new lines were added to the Plays after 1616.

We have no record that "his friends" followed him to the grave, nor a record that anyone of note attended the funeral.

The last quotation is by Ben Jonson and Ben Jonson does not record that he "followed" the Stratford Man—"sorrowing to the grave." We do not know of anyone who did so, certainly not anyone of note.

In conclusion, may I add that readers of the article should remember the writer's frank admissions and doubts, and for these we must give him credit?

ERIC WEBB

Mr. Webb's reply was printed by the newspaper with few deletions, and we are glad to be able to record a more fair-minded attitude than has often been customary in the past. After all, no one can say his letter lacked force!

* * * *

Further Press references to the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy include a comment on Miss Constance Pott's close association with the Canonbury Tower at Islington,—a Tudor building familiar to both Queen Elizabeth and Francis Bacon. Though one of our earliest members, Miss Pott is still extremely active, and tribute is rightly paid to her knowledge of the "ancient lore of the Tower."

Mr. Benjamin Britten is probably among the most gifted of contemporary opera composers, and it seems logical that he should have been commissioned by Her Majesty the Queen to write one for the Coronation next year. The theme is believed to be the story of Elizabeth and Essex, and we trust that Mr. Beverley Baxter's warning (the *Sunday Express* last July) of the thirty-three years difference in age between

the two will be borne in mind. Unfortunately, Mr. Baxter repeats the usual slanders on Bacon, claiming that he "fawned" on Essex, and yet "wrote a savage pamphlet justifying his execution" after appearing against him at his trial. Members will be aware from Spedding's biography, and Alfred Dodd's *Personal Life Story* that these accusations are completely erroneous. Mr. Baxter should realise that to speak of "so fine a mind" being "allied to so black a heart" is to ignore all the accumulated evidence of Spedding, and reiterate the inaccuracies of Macaulay.

Finally, we should like to mention that according to the *New York Herald Tribune*, an eight day Shakespeare Festival was broadcast early in the summer, but as the director received a number of protests from Baconians and others disputing the authorship, it was decided to allot time for the presentation of the anti-Stratfordian case. We sincerely hope that the B.B.C. will, in due course, agree to afford us similar facilities.

* * * *

In our last number we published an informative and interesting article by Brigadier-General F. G. Fuller on the secret background of Francis Bacon's life, and the suggestion was made then that *Hamlet* was, in effect, an autobiography of the author. If this be true, then Mr. Howard Bridgewater's review of *On Hamlet*, by Senor Salvador de Madariaga, acquires additional significance. The book was originally published in 1948 by Messrs. Hollis and Carter, but we feel our readers should decide for themselves whether Hamlet's complete egocentricity is proved. Study of the ego, however (as students of religion and psychology will know) is not limited to personality, and this play may well provide the key to further revelation of Bacon's philosophy and aims.

However Brig.-General Fuller was not correct in asserting (p.89) that Sir Nicholas Bacon "did not mention Francis in his will," and in order to clear away any misconceptions on the subject, we are printing the relevant extract. We are grateful to Mr. Eagle for enabling us to do this.

* * * *

Mr. T. Wright's article challenging Ernest Rose's cipher interpretation of Psalm 46, has aroused considerable interest, and we are grateful for letters on the subject stating both points of view. Further contributions on the subject may be included in a future issue. Meanwhile we would refer readers to the late "James Arther's" views as summarised on another page.

MONTHLY
DISCUSSION GROUP



LECTURE PROGRAMME
1952-53

Tuesday,
December 2nd

THE MIRROR
Mr. W. G. C. Gundry.

Tuesday
February 3rd

THE TWO PENS OF THE MASTER
Com. Pares.

Tuesday
January 6th

THE FIRST FOLIO: ITS MYSTERY
Mr. T. Wright

Tuesday
March 3rd

ROMEO AND JULIET
Mrs. Beryl Pogson



All lectures *are held* at 50A OLD BROMPTON ROAD, S.W.7.
(Underground Rly. and Piccadilly Tube: South Kensington
Station), and *commence* at 6-30 p.m.

Members are encouraged to bring friends.

N.B.—London members should note that Mr. Wright's
Lecture replaces that originally advertised, and to have been
given by the late Mr. Godfrey.

AMERICA'S ASSIGNMENT WITH DESTINY

THE COLONIZATION SCHEME

By MANLY PALMER HALL

THE political intrigues which Queen Elizabeth had inherited from Henry VIII plagued Her Majesty's advisors throughout her long reign. Henry had rebelled against the papacy, ousted its clergy, closed its monastic houses, confiscated its properties, and established the Church of England. Spain, motivated by both religious and secular considerations, was resolved to control England. The Spanish ambassador at the court of the Tudors was the moving spirit behind an elaborate programme of espionage, and all that he could learn, glean, or deduce was dispatched posthaste to his royal master, the King of Spain.

While serving his diplomatic apprenticeship at the court of Navarre, Bacon had been initiated into the new liberalism represented throughout Europe by Secret Societies of intellectuals dedicated to civil and religious freedom. He returned to England fully aware of the intentions of Philip II, the Spanish king. Later, when the moment was propitious, he threw the weight of his literary group with the English colonization plan for America in order to prevent Spanish domination of the New World. The same political considerations apparently also induced him to develop Freemasonry as a further bulwark against the encroachments of the Spanish plot. Cherishing as he did the dream of a great commonwealth in the New Atlantis, Bacon was resolved to prevent his plan from being frustrated by a dominant clergy, supporting and supported by an entrenched aristocracy.

It was necessary for Bacon to conceal both his purposes and the machinery for their fulfillment from the Spanish spies. If the project were prematurely revealed, it could precipitate a desperate political situation. With many courtiers secretly sympathizing with the cause of Spain, and Elizabeth's claim to the throne questioned because of Henry's numerous divorces, it was impossible to use such conventional channels as were provided by an uneasy government. Bacon protected both his cause and his country by acting privately and maturing his schemes within the hallowed walls of the Inns of Court. There in the sanctuary of the martyred Templars, who had earlier felt the full weight of ecclesiastical displeasure, he laboured industriously to fashion wings for the White Horse of Britain.

The rapid progress of England in the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries was due not only to the appearance of a select coterie of wits, but also to the more liberal atmosphere which resulted from "Harry's" religious house cleaning. After the Armada,

the issues were partly clarified, but it still remained vital to protect and enlarge the English interests in the Western Hemisphere. Incidentally, the ships of the Armada carried ninety Spanish Inquisitors, with all the paraphernalia of their office, ready to set up the Inquisition in conquered England. The Pope had already claimed the three Americas for the Church, but the English colonizers were resolved to dispute this claim with every resource at their disposal.

The first permanent English settlement in North America was established at Jamestown, Virginia, on May 14th, 1607. Earlier attempts resulted only in the naming of the region, which was called Virginia in honour of Queen Elizabeth. In 1609, Sir George Somers was appointed governor of the colony of Virginia. He sailed for the New World with dignity appropriate to his office, but his arrival was delayed when his ship foundered on the Hog Islands. Later he was able to victual two pinnaces with prime pork and to proceed on his journey. The Hog Islands, so-named because of the wild swine that infested them, were renamed the Somers Islands in honour of Sir George's impromptu visit. Ultimately, however, these islands were called the Bermudas, after the Spanish navigator Juan Bermudez.

In 1609, James I granted a charter to the Bermuda Company, and in 1612, Richard More and sixty colonists from Virginia settled on



The Somers Islands Shilling

one of the islands. Later, in 1616, Captain John Smith appointed Master Daniel Tucker as governor of Bermuda. The same year, a series of coins was struck off for use in the Bermudas. The history of this coinage is extremely obscure. The Hog Money, as it is often called, was of brass and in three denominations. The shilling of this issue bears on the obverse the legend "Somers Islands," surrounding the figure of a wild boar. Above the boar is the numeral XII, signifying twelpence. There is no date. The reverse of the coin is a ship under full sail. The wild boar on this coinage carries the definite impression of being a heraldic device. It is identical in drawing with the crest of Lord Bacon, even to the jaunty curl of its porcine tail.

According to the meagre records in the British Museum, this

coinage was forbidden by James I to be exported. It seems strange that the Hog Money should have been regarded so unfavourably by the king. Why did James on two separate occasions act so strenuously to prevent the circulation of this coinage? The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1946) intimates that the coins were struck in America, but numismatic catalogues describe them as made *for* America. From the evidence of the coins themselves, it would seem that the Hog Money was a definite landmark, bearing witness to the operations of the Secret Society directing the early colonization programme.

The adventures of Sir George Somers were quickly adapted to high drama by the literary workshop at Gray's Inn. The most obvious example of their ingenuity was *The Tempest*. This play first appeared about one and a half years after the governor had been shipwrecked. According to the chronological chart of the Shakespearean plays, *The Tempest* was first acted in 1611, was played a second time in 1613, but was not published until the great folio of 1623. It is supposed that the play was written between 1608 and 1610, but there is no data as to whether or not it was among those rewritten before final publication.

The character of Prospero, magician, philosopher, and Duke of Milan, is believed to be based upon a historical person whose name was Prospero Colonna. It is interesting that Columbus usually signed himself "Colon," and that Lord Bacon has been referred to as "the little Columbus of literature." *The Tempest* also introduces an "honest old counsellor," by name Gonzalo, who seems dedicated to a utopian mood. He refers to the magic isle as a "commonwealth," and explains that if he had a plantation there (a term used in describing colonial grants in America) he would design it along communal lines, concluding:

"All things in common Nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavor: treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine
Would I not have: but Nature should bring forth
Of its own kind, all foyzon, all abundance
To feed my innocent people."

The patrons of the Virginia Company included Lord Southampton and those two, that "incomparable paire," William, Earl of Pembroke, and Phillip, Earl of Montgomery, to whom the first folio of Shakespeare was dedicated. These excellent gentlemen also permitted the use of their names as patrons of that company of actors which included William Shakespeare—a tight little corporation, to say the least. So elaborate a plan would not have been necessary had the colonization programme involved nothing more than the granting of land to royal favourites.

It makes little practical difference whether the flora and fauna of *The Tempest* resembles the Bermudas, or as Dr. Hale suggests, corresponds more closely with the Cuttyhunk Island off the coast of Massachusetts. The opponents of the Bermudian hypothesis insist

that the play would have mentioned the wild hogs had these islands been the locale of the story. If Bacon and his Society were involved in the project, it would scarcely have been advisable for them to emphasize the hog symbol, which had already been used with discretion on several occasions. They could not afford to tie the Shakespearean productions so obviously with their scheme. They were satisfied to leave their mark and seal on the emblematic coinage.

The "brave New World," referred to by Miranda, is certainly America and not some insignificant island. Prospero is the magician of the New Age, the exponent of the Baconian "method." He binds the elements to his service, and the story of his adventures is an improvisation upon the grand theme of the Utopias. It was also in this "brave New World" that he buried his magic staff and drowned his book; that is, concealed in appropriate places the formulas which were the secret of his power.

Thomas Jefferson examined the "repositories" of the Bacon group in colonial America, checked their contents, and caused them to be resealed for future ages. Several attempts have been made to locate these "philosophical tombs," including excavations in England, Newfoundland, and Virginia. What is believed to be an important Baconian vault was located, with the help of coded tombstones, in Williamsburg, Virginia, in 1938.¹

After his "banishment" from public life, Bacon muses thus upon the philosophical advantages of political decline: "Methinks they are resembled by those of Sir George Somers, who being bound by his employment to another coast, was by *tempest* cast upon the Bermudas. And therefore a ship wrack'd man made full discovery of a new temperate fruitful region, which non had before inhabited; and which Mariners, who had only seen its rocks, had esteemed an inaccessible and enchanted place." In his advice to Sir George Villiers, Bacon expressed the same sentiments which had been incorporated in the Broad-sides of the Council for Virginia. According to Alexander Brown, "he may have taken these ideas from those Broad-sides, or he may have been one of the original authors of them, as he was a member of that Council."²

The same author was so impressed by Bacon's references to "tempest and the inaccessible and enchanted Bermudas" that he asks: "May not Bacon have aided Shakespeare in compiling *some* of his plays? . . . Bacon always had a fancy for such things." Dr. Brown also mentions the Bacon family in America, noting that Benjamin Harrison, the twenty-third President of the United States, was *doubtly* descended from this family.

It is not without reason that Lord Bacon, who has been called "the moving spirit in the colonization scheme," included Christopher Columbus as one of the "great inventors."³ Judge Brown writes of

¹See *Foundations Unearthed*, by Marie Bauer.

²See *Genesis of the United States*.

³See *The New Atlantis*.

Bacon's participation in the settlement of Newfoundland: "It was entirely due to the Great Chancellor's influence that the king granted the advances and issued the Charters to Bacon and his associates in Guy's Newfoundland Company."⁴ *The Colonial State Calendar* contains the following extract of patent: "To Henry, Earl of Northampton, Sir Francis Bacon, and others, for the Colony or plantation in Newfoundland from 46° to 52° N. Lat., together with the seas and islands lying within ten leagues of the coast. . . ." The same notes: "A letter is mentioned from John Smith to Lord Bacon enclosing description of New England, the extraordinary profits arising from the *fisheries*, and great facilities for *plantation*."



Stamp of Newfoundland

Issued to commemorate the tercentenary of the colonization scheme and Lord Bacon, its guiding spirit.

(Reproduced by kind permission of Messrs. Stanley Gibbons, Ltd., London)

William Hepworth Dixon, of the Inner Temple, writing in 1861, makes several important observations concerning the settlement of the New World. A few fragments will indicate the direction of his thinking: "In no History of America, in no Life of Bacon, have I found one word to connect him with the plantation of that great Republic. Yet, like Raleigh and Delaware, he takes an active share in the labours, a conspicuous part in the sacrifices through which the foundations of Virginia and the Carolinas are first laid. Like men of far less note, who have received far higher honours in America, Bacon pays his money into the great Company, and takes office in its management as one of the Council. To his other glories therefore must be added that of a Founder of New States . . .

"All generous spirits rush to the defence of Virginia. Bacon joins the Company with purse and voice. Montgomery, Pembroke, and Southampton, the noble friends of Shakespeare, join it . . . A fleet, commanded by Gates and Somers, sails from the Thames, to meet on its voyage at sea those singular and poetic storms and trials which add the Bermudas to our empire and *The Tempest* to our literature. . .

"One hundred and seventy-five years after Walter Raleigh laid down his life in Palace Yard for America, his illustrious blood paid for

⁴See *History of Newfoundland*.

by Gondomar in Spanish gold, the citizens of Carolina, framing for themselves a free constitution, remembered the man to whose genius they owed their existence as a state. They called the capital of their country *Raleigh*. The United States can also claim among their muster roll of Founders the no less noble name of Francis Bacon. Will the day come, when, dropping such feeble names as Troy and Syracuse, the people of the Great Republic will give the august and immortal name of Bacon to one of their splendid cities?"⁵

⁵See *Personal History of Lord Bacon*.

BACON'S "WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS" RE-CONSIDERED

By MARTIN PARES

Saint Augustine, when asked which of many interpretations of the Scriptures could be regarded as correct, replied "the more interpretations the better." In this opinion (though possibly not in all opinions) the Saint was in precise agreement with Lord Bacon in believing that every inspired or poetical writing might be credited with intending as many reasonable interpretations as it was found to bear.

It is pleasant and tempting to assume that everything in Bacon or Shake-speare, which merits understanding, has already been understood, and that new interpretations, if not an outrage, are clearly a waste of time. On the other hand, the Art of Interpretation was dwelt upon with great insistence by Francis Bacon, who regarded it as a way of exercising and deepening the understanding.

These interpretations of a re-translation of Bacon's *Wisdom of the Ancients* are put forward with all due modesty. No authority is quoted for them and the writer is ready at any time to put them aside in favour of better ones. As Bacon himself said "Fables are pliant material and can be twisted any way you please." It seems however, that they could also be used as an effective and pleasant approach into the "Mine of Truth" which stands behind them.

CASSANDRA OR DIVINATION

It is related that Apollo, being enamoured of Cassandra, was by her various shifts frustrated in his desire, and yet fed on with Hope until she had drawn from him the gift of prophecy. And, having by a trick obtained what she wanted, she flatly rejected him. Whereupon he, unable to revoke his rash gift, burning for revenge and disdaining to be outdone by a crafty wench, annexed this penalty—to wit—that she should ever foretell the Truth but never be believed. Thus were her prophecies ever faithful but never heeded, and her continual warnings of approaching ruin to her country were disregarded, for no one would listen.

* * * *

This fable seems to indicate the unprofitable nature of untimely advice. People that are so stubborn and conceited as to reject the teaching of Apollo, the God of Harmony (whereby to distinguish the tone and rhythm of affairs, the sharps and flats of discourse, and the proper times of Speech and of Silence)—these, notwithstanding their prudence, candour and powers of persuasion, will find themselves of no avail in the management of affairs. Indeed they are more likely to hasten on the ruin of those whom they advise, and not until calamity has justified their warnings, will they be revered, too late, as far-sighted prophets.

Of this we have a classic example in Marcus Cato of Utica who, as from a watch-tower, descried afar off and long foretold the calamity and tyranny approaching his country from the conjunction and opposition of Caesar and Pompey. But in all this he accomplished nothing, but rather hastened on the troubles of his country, as was neatly observed by Cicero in a letter to a friend—"Cato judges well but prejudices the State. For he speaks as from the Commonwealth of Plato, and not as from the dregs of Romulus."

* * *

This fable may perhaps be taken also as a warning against premature development of the psychic faculties, before the animal nature has been dominated. For until the natural man has been subjected to the rhythm of a higher life (represented here by the Harmony of Apollo) there will always be a risk of misusing whatsoever psychic gifts may have been bestowed.

It is idle to suppose that an artificial or forced development of mediumistic power gives anyone a right to the management of affairs. Moreover it is unlikely that such glimpses of the future (however accurate they may subsequently appear) will often manage to stay the hand of destiny, or deflect for one instant the purpose of Deity, as committed to such an instrument as, for instance, Julius Caesar.

Although in some cases the psychic powers may be an asset, yet, even when there is a legitimate occasion for consulting the Divine oracles, or good grounds for respecting a prophecy, it is well to remember the observation of Cicero as related above. For he clearly distinguishes between the fateful properties of a pronouncement coming from the archetypal plane—the Commonwealth of Plato—and the comparative futility of mundane conjecture, exhaled from the "dregs of Romulus."

JUNO'S SUITOR OR DISGRACE

The poets tell how Jupiter, in pursuing his loves, took sundry forms—a bull, an eagle, a swan, and even a shower of golden rain. But when courting Juno he assumed the degrading and ridiculous shape of a miserable cuckoo, storm-dazed and drenched with rain, trembling and half-dead.

* * *

The fable is a wise one and seems to come from the very bowels of morality. Men are not to imagine that an exhibition of their virtues will always win them favour, for that depends upon the nature of those whom they would court. If the latter be persons of no great endowment but rather of a proud and malignant disposition (such as Juno), then it is better to drop all appearance of honour or dignity. In fact it is foolish to proceed otherwise; for it is not enough to descend to the deformity of obsequiousness without assuming an abject and degenerated mask.

* * *

To those who are self-isolated by their pride or separatism there is but one effective approach, and that is by means of a mask or per-

sonality which is complementary to their own. For such people can usually be wooed from their self-appointed orbit, but seldom forced.

Moreover, as the fable suggests, it is the magnetic and all-embracing power of love which at once imposes and obeys this law; and it may be truly said of the Creator that He evokes this power in His creatures *each after their kind*, and in no other way.

In man's first glimpse of love—often his only glimpse—the law is demonstrated. For, through the mask or personality of the beloved comes a moment of vision, a strangely heightened consciousness of life, which floods to all other living things. It is perhaps that touch of Nature which "makes the whole world Kin". But the fable also seems to indicate that no mask, personality, shape or form is too low or degrading if it can awaken, in some more arrogant or self-isolated nature, an echo of this celestial quality.

A MEDICAL COMEDY OF ERRORS

By W. BURRIDGE, D.M., M.A.(Oxon.)

A RECENT film comedy has essentially the same plot as the Comedy of Errors in that it deals with the strange results of two men looking alike. In both comedies the deceit is what may be called a deceit of the outer eye; much more subtle, however, is the deceit wrought to the human understanding or "inner eye" by an error of "over-generalisation" in a trusted definition.

Such definitions belong to the order of things termed by Bacon received opinions and he further observed that they had a mischievous capacity for being insinuated into philosophy and science. They come first, and everything that follows has to be brought into conformity with them.

It happened that the branch of medical science which I professed namely, physiology, accepted more than a century ago a definition which contains an unsuspected error of "over-generalisation" whereby two separates have been confused together as one. Nevertheless the resulting comedy of errors, can still masquerade as sound science just as it could in the days of Bacon.

A fundamental concept of modern medicine is the possession by all living substance of property called excitability or irritability which is definable as the capacity of a living structure to respond to the action of an external agent called the stimulus. This property is studied in the frog's muscle-nerve preparation which is the dissected calf muscle together with its nerve, the sciatic nerve. This preparation, when left to itself, just remains inert. It can be galvanised into activity by an electric current but, when this is done, the resulting activity is discontinuous. If the current be strong enough, the muscle will give a brief contraction or twitch when the current starts, remain inactive while the current subsequently passes and, finally, give another twitch when it is stopped.

Medical terminology calls the electric current the "stimulus" because it is the external agent to which the muscle reacts. The muscle itself is the excitable structure which, in virtue of its possession of excitability, can respond to the action of the stimulus. The response is the muscular twitch. Such experiments reveal the triad composed of stimulus, excitable structure, and response. Little imagination is required to visualise the same triad everywhere at work within us. Taking the eye as the example, light is the stimulus, the eye itself is the excitable structure, and the response is seeing. The same holds for the other senses. Again inside the body, any drug taken on the doctor's prescription or your own becomes a stimulus, the organ on which it acts is the excitable structure, and what the drug effects through that structure is the response. A stimulus may also be called a change of environment. This being noted, it becomes reasonable to infer that we react to changes in our environment through the

excitability of our sense-organs. Such, so far, all doctors have believed. However, the idea came to me one day to investigate excitability through the beating heart and drugs. The heart was the excitable structure, the drug was the stimulus, and any alteration in the mode of beating was the response.

My first attempts at demonstration could be deemed unsuccessful. They were embodied in a paper which was sent to the late Professor A. R. Cushny, F.R.S., who returned it with words of well-meant warning and advice. The beating heart should not be used for such a purpose, but only to more practical ends; the proper place to study excitability was the muscle-nerve preparation. Moreover, there were the highly important considerations that if my cardiac results only confirmed those already obtained with that preparation they would be quite superfluous, *whereas, if they disagreed*, everybody would regard them as pernicious. Now if I had not been acquainted with the fact that similar arguments had been put forward centuries before to justify the burning of the library at Alexandria, Cushny's advice might well have been taken. Moreover, as things turned out, Cushny was right. Facts contrary to the philosophy of that preparation were found and were condemned in *The British Medical Journal* solely as being *contrary to all the canons and principles of physiological thought*.

Cushny's remarks revealed what Bacon would call a "received opinion" that gave rise to a habit. Because everybody had done the thing in a particular way from the start, everybody must do it in the same way to the end. This received opinion has given rise to a state of affairs similar to that portrayed in the *Comedy of Errors*. The definitions of stimulus and excitability led doctors to believe that two different things were one and the same. When the first different thing denied being the other, so to speak, the denial was not accepted; instead, a theory or explanation was adduced which enabled the received opinion to be retained.

This erroneous process may be shown by comparing guns and motors. They both possess the equivalent of excitability, the former in the explosiveness of their powder, the latter in the explosiveness of the gases in their cylinders. But motors have another property which is not possessed by guns, in as much as the strengths of the explosions can be varied. In medical parlance, guns obey an "all or nothing" law.

This statement implies that, once the minimum force to fire a gun has been applied to its trigger, no amount of extra force applied thereto will make the shot hit the quarry harder. By contrast, a motor is a lively structure possessing a sense-organ in its accelerator pedal. The natural stimulant of this latter is foot pressure, and the motor's response thereto is a speed which varies according to the strength of the stimulus. Motors also show "after-discharge"; another way of saying that they do not stop dead when pressure on the accelerator pedal is released, i.e., the effects of stimulation last longer than the period of application.

If we imagine Puck to have provided motorists with the idea that motors work like guns and that, in consequence, all that was needed to understand the working of motors was a course of instruction in the firing of guns, some understanding will be obtained of the erroneous idea supplied by Puck to doctors. The result in either case would be a "comedy of errors" provided by "received opinion." This opinion would determine that the motor's accelerator pedal would be called a trigger, and the next expectation would be that pressure on one "trigger" should give the same effects as pressure on the other. If in practice these effects are different, two courses are open; either the received opinion must be abandoned, or else a theory must be formulated which wrests the facts into agreement with the opinion. Everybody in the *Comedy of Errors* adopts the latter course, and the doctors have done likewise.

The agent called stimulus in the definition above gives effects of the "all or nothing" type when it acts on the elements of the muscle-nerve preparation but, on the beating heart, it gives effects analagous to those which follow on the pressing down of an accelerator pedal. The same property called "excitability" gives the "all or nothing" of the one and the "variation" of the other. To call any two different things by the same name, then assume that they are alike because they have a common name, can only create muddle.

Bacon knew that such muddles can seemingly be straightened out by a process which he called "wresting". Ingenious theories have been elaborated to enable the doctors to explain why it is that a motor cannot safely turn from Picadilly into Bond Street when travelling at 80 miles per hour, by arguments connected solely with the explosiveness of the gases in the cylinders, and without reference to momentum. The late Sir Charles Sherrington was such an adept at the solution of such problems that I told my students that, had he taken up law instead of medicine, everybody whom he prosecuted would have been convicted, and everybody whom he defended would have got off. At law, of course, opposing counsel, arguing to opposite ends, wrest facts differently and the judge is expected to treat these as a Baconian.

A similar state of affairs to that suggested must have existed in the days of Bacon, since he refers to a class of philosophers who, "having bestowed much diligent and careful labour on too few experiments, have thence made bold to educe and construct systems, wresting all other facts in strange fashion into conformity therewith." There is no question of the diligent and careful labour that has been expended on examining the muscle-nerve preparation, and no new methods of generating, detecting, or measuring electricity have yet been discovered which were not forthwith pressed into service as an aid to the better understanding of excitability. Bacon's "too few", however, must be taken to imply "of too limited scope." The experiments have been numberless; but in scope, they have been too narrow.

Going back to what Prof. Cushny wrote, we learn that this narrowness of scope was determined by *tradition* or *received opinion* which

in ordinary life becomes an unwritten rule. There are what we call the Laws of Nature, and we put questions to her about them when we do experiments of research. When a new discovery is made, and its finder considers its significance, he is prone to forget that Nature cross-examines him as he does so! Should he make an error, he has this advantage over the other witness in the box in having the time to weave his replies into a consistent whole. The result is some "system" of thought or, perhaps, of modern psychology.

My training at Oxford made me an enthusiast for the all-embracing nature of excitability, it also made me an admirer of the many ingenious theories to which that error of over-generalisation has given birth. Such admiration has been general and widespread and I have since found that this pre-occupation with ingenious theories has led some scientists of medicine to disregard a fundamental belief of other scientists, who believe that valid basic principles enable you to make accurate predictions of facts.

The average accuracy of the daily weather forecasts, for example, shows that the bases for such predicting have validity. Yet, when certain doctors were sent, for opinion, three predictions which were subsequently and unknowingly confirmed by the carefully performed experiments of another, not one noted that accurate predictions could only be made from valid basic principles. Three replies from Oxford, however, should be of interest. The one ascribed accurate predicting to the sub-conscious, another to the inner consciousness, while the third found a parallel in modern confirmation of some of the speculations of Lucretius. Out of three philosophers, two failed to reply; the other was emphatic that such predictions could only be made from sound basic principles. Flattering references to Einstein and Mendeléeff were met from other sources.

In as much as Bacon refers to a class of philosophers who did too few experiments, it is inferable that he knew of several schools of them. In any case, a seeming inevitable consequence of too few experiments will be over-generalisation which, in its turn, implies that A and B, though separate entities, will be confused (as were the twins of the comedy). It is significant, too, that, although there is comedy, no one is a fool. The errors made are reasonably made, and by reasonable people.

The educing of a system which is based on *too few experiments* can only be achieved by men of high intelligence who can give considerable thought to the matter. To explain how a fish placed in a bowl already full of water causes it to be spilt, is child's play to explaining that no water will be spilt. Any one who believes he has given a feasible explanation of the latter thesis can feel proud of what is a truly remarkable achievement. The last thing such a man would want to know would be that he had '*solved*' an *artificial problem*. Perhaps in this way it has come about that doctors show a preference for involved explanations. Medical "received opinion" is that an event must be explained, which means that the received opinion draws all things to itself; and (as Bacon knew), anything contrary

to that opinion will be set aside by some distinction, the "sub-conscious" and "inner consciousness" being excellent examples of such.

As is well known, the British Association for the Advancement of Science and the British Medical Association hold annual meetings whereat there is entertainment as well as science and medicine. It might be worth while for the Baconian Society to suggest to both that they should stage annually *The Comedy of Errors* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, not as comedies but as serious morality plays! For, although at these meetings an item of great human interest may be the attempt of Professor A to wipe the floor verbally with Professor B, and vice-versa, the results of such duels are apt to be as inconsequential as that between Lysander and Demetrius.

Once, however, the innate capacity of a Baconian "idol of the theatre" to give rise to "barking disputation" becomes more generally known, such disputation might be replaced by a common search for "Puck." In any case, once a man can visualise himself as Demetrius before the fight, he will be well on the way to that state of mind which the Psalmist knew to be the basis of wisdom.

Readers will be interested to know that Canonbury Tower is being let to new tenants. The Tower is a sixteenth century building and after serving as an abode for the priors of St. Bartholomew's, passed to Sir John Spencer, a Lord Mayor of London. The fine Tudor rooms include that in which a lead bullet was fired into the panelling,—reputedly by Sir Walter Raleigh. Sir Francis Bacon, as is mentioned editorially, had close connections with the Tower, and Oliver Goldsmith and Charles Lamb are believed to have used it.

NOEL FERMOR

CARPENTER'S GEOGRAPHY

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON

THERE is a rare old book entitled "Geography delineated forth in two bookes containing the sphaericall and topical parts thereof" by Nathanael Carpenter Fellow of Exceter Colledge in Oxford dated 1625. The Title page appears to have been earmarked by Francis Bacon as the type is set so as to show a signature as follows:

GEOGRAPHY
DELINEATED
FORTH IN TWO
BOOKES
CONTAINING THE SPHAERICALL
AND TOPICAL PARTS
THEREOF
BY NATHANAEL CARPENTER
FELLOW OF EXCETER COLLEDGE

The first book consists of 274 pages and contains a Dedication "To the right honourable William Earl of Pembroke" signed "Your honours poore servant to command Nathanael Carpenter."

At the top of the first page of the dedication to the Earl of Pembroke we find Francis Bacon's well known Double A ornament, very similar to that which is found at the top of the 13th page of the First Folio of the "Shakespeare" plays.

The second book of 286 pages contains a different Dedication "To the right honourable Philip Earle of Montgomery" and is signed "Your honours in all duty and service to be commanded Nathanael Carpenter." It will be remembered that the First Folio of the "Shakespeare" Plays is dedicated to *these same two noblemen*. This book is a very learned study of geography and the style is very similar to that which we find in Francis Bacon's philosophical works. The two dedications are also in the same style as the dedications in other books written by Francis Bacon and published under the names of other men.

Who was Nathanael Carpenter? There are four references to the name.

The first is in Thomas Fuller's *History of the Worthies of England*, Vol. 1, p.424, where Fuller writes "Nathanael Carpenter, son to a minister, was born in this country, bred fellow of Exeter Colledge in Oxford. He was right learned in the cyclopaedia of all arts—logic—witness his decades, mathematics—expressed in his book of geography and divinity appearing in his excellent sermons."

The second is in *The Worthies of Devon* by John Prince, 1810, pp.173-5, where Prince writes "His works testify to his being a noted logician, philosopher, mathematician, poet, geographer and divine. He went to Ireland when he was advanced to a certain deanery—nor indeed is there anything remarkable (except the books he published) recorded of him." A list is then given of books published under his name. Prince states that he died in Dublin in 1635.

The third is in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 9, pp.161-2, where he is stated to have been born on 7th February, 1588-9 and to have been at Exeter College in 1607. He is referred to as a noted philosopher,

poet, mathematician and geographer. He is supposed to have died in 1628.

The fourth is in *Late Tudor and early Stuart Geography 1583-1650*, by E. G. R. Taylor, 1934, pp.136-7. There is little information in this book except that "the year 1625 had seen the publication at Oxford of a very important Geography that of Nathanael Carpenter Fellow of Exeter."

Apart from the books published under his name, Nathanael Carpenter does not appear to have had any history. In one place we are told that he died in 1628 and in another the date of his death is given as 1635, and no one knows where he was buried. If he was born in 1588-9 he would only be thirty-six years of age when the Geography was published and it is doubtful if such a young man could have been able to acquire the necessary knowledge to write this book, which is extremely learned and shows the result of very many years of study.

FRANCIS BACON'S POSTHUMOUS REPLIES

By BRIG.-GEN. F. G. FULLER

[*Editor's Note.*—We feel that the extracts from the Biliteral Cypher given in this article may do two things. Firstly, they may help the student to decide whether the thoughts behind them are essentially Baconian, or might have been invented by Mrs. Gallup. Secondly, they appear to supply good answers to a number of questions often put to us.]

The following extracts from the Biliteral cypher are taken from the works indicated.

1. *Does it matter who wrote Shakespeare?*

In *Novum Organum*, 1620

"This shall be the great work of this age. Its fame shall spread abroad to farthest lands beyond the seas and as the name of Francis Bacon shall be spoken that of his decypherer joined with his own must receive equal honour."

In *Novum Organum*

"I have lost therein a present fame that I may, out of anie doubt, recover it in our own or other lands after many a long year. I think some ray that farre off morning, will glimmer even into the tomb where I shall lie."

2. *Who "wrote" Shakespeare?*

In *L. Diggs*

"Francis of Verulam is author of all plays heretofore published by Marlowe Green Peele Shakespeare and two and twenty now put forward for the first time. Some are altered to continue his history.
F.St.A."

In *de Augmentis*, 1623

"You can find the chief of the playes, of which great hope is at present indulged, published in Fol. I reserve four to be kept until I shall put out in not less worthy forms all those so long given unto other men to whose names they have brought reputation albeit they have not a value, which truly my own and others opinions found both in some early plaies, poems—the sonnets the Rape of Lucrece etcetera—and in later put out in the name (as it had been the work) of Wm. Shakespeare. It is without doubt the worthiest of my works being so much praised by those judges to whom all are first referred."

3. *Why write under an assumed name?**In Colin Clout*

"Marlowe is also a pen name ere taking Wm. Shakespeare as my mask or vizard that I should remaine unknowne inasmuch as we having worked in drama, history that is most vigorously suppress, have put ourselfe soe greatly in danger that a word unto Queen Elizabeth, without doubt, would give us a soudaine horrible end."

In Pericles

"All men who write stage plays are held in contempt. For this reason none say "how strange" when a plaie cometh accompanied with gold, asking a name by which one putting it forth shall not be recognized or thought to be cognisant of its existence. For this cause if rare stories must have a hiding, no other could be so safe, for the men who had won gold in any way did not readily acquaint any man, least of these a stranger, with his source of wealth, as you may well understand."

4. *Was Bacon then ashamed of writing for the stage?**In Novum Organum*

"All that learn that I who accompte the truth better than wicked vanitie, published manie playes under other cognomen will think the motive distaste of the stage. In no respect is this true, yet I shall make knowne to him who can read cypher writing, a motive stronger than this, were it such since man has a greater desire to live than he hath to win fame, and my life had four eager spyces on it, not alone by day but by night also."

5. *How were the pen names chosen?**In Novum Organum*

"When I at length having written in diverse stiles found three who for sufficient reward in gold added to an immediate renown as good pens willingly put forward works which I had composed, I was bolder."

In Merry Wives of Windsor

"Greene Spencer Peele Shakespeare and Marley as you may sometimes see it, or as it is usually given Marlowe, have thus farre been my masks, which have caused no marked surprise because they have familiar names on the title page, not fancied but of living men at least of men that have lived."

6. *Was it expensive?**In Treatise of Melancholy*

"Verily to make choices of mouthpieces for our voice is far from being a light or pleasing, but quite necessary and important mission; and it often in truth swalloweth all we receive from our writings ere such cost be paid."

7. *Why was it necessary to write his story in cypher?**In Measure for Measure*

"Some do not fully know the imminent perill that overhung my life at the time the plays were first put forth, nor could one word of my birth or title be published if not wrapt up, mixed, disguised."

In de Augmentis

"Perills manifold though secret, that of summary vengeance on the part of her Ma. more than all other dangers hovering above us followed our waye and fettered our movements."

In Novum Organum

"A fear seemed to haunt her mind that a king might suit the mounting ambitions of a people that began to seek New Atlantis beyond the seas."

8. *Why scatter the story in little bits?**In Phantomachia*

"It hath been our practice from the first cypher epistle to the present letter to scatter the history widely, having great fear always that our roiall mother may, by some ill chance, come upon the matter, and our life be forfeit ere half this labour be ended."

In Novum Organum

"Since the part that contained the story of my birth is one I cannot have lost it is frequently given."

9. *Why put any non-secret matter in cypher?**In the Fox*

"And yet I have also employed my cyphers for other than secret matters in many of my later books, because it hath now become so much an acte of habite, I am at a losse at this present, having less dificile labour now than in former times in Her Ma. service."

10. *Is the cypher too difficult?**In Historia Vitae et Mortis*

"In truth fear is growing within me that this is all a lost labour, for it doth seem too well hidden to find the light of daie, and it doth ever wage the warre in my heart with most earnest desire for sweete assurance of a safety I have not for many a day felt."

In Novum Organum

"The hidden history somewhat like a tortoise that scarcely putteth his head out of the shell but he endangereth the whole body and my work is less pleasing to write or decypher, from the shifts of many sortes necessarie to preserve the secret."

II. *How was it possible to print the cypher secretly?**In Midsummer Night's Dream*

"Not alone for pride in our science for a field of hard labour, but also that I might be at liberty to use these workes as the exterior letter, hiding my secret writings, as no other person is cogniza't of the work save my foster brother Anthony, my owne brother Robert, Ben Jonson my friend, adviser and assistant, and our private secretary, yet for the exterior part we emploie many amanuenses."

12. *How could one man have written so much?**In Henry VI, Part I*

"The works I do mid rankes truly ignorant of such attempts, would seem greater than the parts of the men of my time have known of. Indeed it may not winn any belief since it would seem more than—"

In Henry VI, Part III

"—the hand of but a mortall could (by any manner of working known to authors) unayded and alone perform."

In Natural History

"One must give as great a portion of time as seven days a week can furnish and must not use many hours for recreation, would he leave ought of any value to men, for life is so short. It is for this cause I use my time so miserly, never spending a moment idly, when in health.

Surely my hand and brain have but short rest, I firmly believe it were not in the power of humane being to do more than I have done."

THE RECORDS OF FRANCIS BACON'S EARLY LIFE

By E. R. WOOD

HOW often do we find, when looking up the details of a famous man's life, that little is known of his childhood and early youth. Apart from such official records as parish registers, university account books and degree records, and entrance books of the legal Inns and City Companies, the principal source of information is the man himself through the reminiscences in his own writings and the second-hand scraps noted by his friends. Indeed we should hardly expect more direct evidence, for a child is unlikely to attract attention until his genius has developed and been generally recognised. To reconstruct his early years the records made at the time are generally more reliable than those depending on memory. We all know the strange tricks that memory can play.

Francis Bacon is no exception. The facts we possess of his childhood are meagre. In this article I propose to leave aside the "memorial" reconstructions, such as the first part of William Rawley's *Life*, and examine the value of some of the contemporary documents. Many of these were known to that indefatigable and careful investigator James Spedding, whose *Life of Francis Bacon* is still the best account, but fresh light has been thrown on them recently.

Strange as it may seem, the first contemporary reference to Francis Bacon is *not* the baptismal entry in the Register of St. Martin-in-the-Fields but the entry in the churchwarden's accounts of that parish for the year Christmas 1560 to Christmas 1561:—

"Charges disbursed . . In Christmas quarter. [This means 3 months *after* Christmas 1560] ffirst payed to two poore folkes for making cleane of the church layne when the Lorde kepers child came thither to be christened iiij^d
St. Martin's Churchwardens' Accounts 1525-1603
ed. J. V. Kitto, 1901, p.190.

(This is not an unusual kind of entry. The same sum was paid in the same year for making clean of the church lane "againste the Lordes and ladies came to Christne master baptistes Childe" and at Christmas.)

Many have supposed that the baptismal entry in the Register of St. Martin-in-the-Fields:—

[1560/61] "Januarij: . . 25. Baptizatus fuit Mr Franciscus Bacon filius Dm: Nicho: Bacon Magni Anglie sigilli Custodis" is an original entry made at the time of the christening and have based arguments on that assumption. That the entry is part of a *transcription* made in 1598 is evident from the note on page 4 of the Register:—

"A Register booke for the p'ishe Church of St Martin's in the ffelds in the Countye of Midds. made in the Dayes of Mr Thomas Knight, Vicar of the same p'ishe Church: And in the tyme of Mr John Childe and Mr Thomas Bengé then Church-

wardens, in the Yeare of o^r Lorde God 1598 And in the XL1th Yeare of the raygne of o^r Sou'eign' Ladye Elizabeth, of Englande ffraunce & Irelande Queene, Defendor of y^e faithe, &c. Written by Jacob Cornewe, Sexton of the same p'ishe Churchē at y^t tyme."

Harleian Soc. Registers Vol XXV. 1898

What could be clearer than that? The Churchwardens' Accounts record that the parchment Register cost 35s., the previous paper one having been but 18 pence. Jacob Cornewe was paid £3 10s. for his task of "newe wrighting & Ingrossing" the Register book. This is perhaps not too high a sum considering that the entries for about fifty years for this busy parish had to be copied.

By 1597 the old paper parish registers throughout the country had become dilapidated. The Archbishop, bishops and clergy of the province of Canterbury therefore issued a canon in that year ordering fresh copies to be made in parchment books. The extant Register of St. Martin's is one of these copies. Few of the original paper registers have survived but a comparison of such as are extant shows that the copies were made with varying degrees of accuracy and were not checked. It is not possible to decide now what the original entry of Francis Bacon's baptism was. As the "Mr" was added at some indeterminate time after 1598 (as the caret and different ink show) it is useless to speculate on the significance of that addition.

The next records relate to Francis Bacon's residence at Trinity College, Cambridge. As Mr. R. L. Eagle's article in the July 1952 *BACONIANA* deals admirably with these I need not give details here. It is, however, not generally known that a letter written by Francis Bacon while at Trinity to his eldest half brother Nicholas is preserved at Cambridge. By permission of the Syndics of the Fitzwilliam Museum I give the text of the letter which is in their collection:—

"After my hartie commendations unto you and to my Sisters. Sir sith it is so that you have promised my Cosin Sharpe a buck agaynst this Commencement, and the time draweth so neere; I have to desyre you because he now hath sent for it, and he must needes be at great Charges if the messenger tary there upon his own cost, that you will so use the messenger that he be at no cost eyther for lodginge or meate and drinke whilst he is with you. Besides this, if you will show my Cosin at my request so much Curtesy that he may pay the keeper no fees for the same Buck, ye shall both pleasure him and me very much. Thus desiringe you to doe this for me I leave you to the tuition of God. At Cambridge the third day of July 1574

Your lovinge brother

Francis Bacon

My brother had written unto you if he by reason of sore eyes had not taried at London."

[Endorsed:] "To my very lovinge brother m^r Nicholas Bacon at Redgrave gevee theese."

The letter is in a fairly neat "secretary" script.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this admittedly mundane letter is its revelation that, at the age of thirteen, Bacon was already concerned with the welfare of his friends. I have not yet been able to identify "cousin Sharpe" with certainty but am inclined to think he was a Nicholas Sharpe who matriculated as a pensioner from Trinity at Michaelmas 1566, was a scholar 1568, B.A. 1570-1, M.A. 1574 and Fellow 1573. (Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part I, Vol. IV, 1927) Notice that this Nicholas Sharpe took his M.A. degree at the very "Commencement" mentioned in the letter. He is very likely the Nicholas Sharpe "of Barnard's Inn" who was admitted to Gray's Inn in 1576, the same year as Anthony and Francis Bacon. (Foster, *Regr. of Admissions to Grays Inn*, 1889.) Barbara, a sister of Bacon's father Sir Nicholas, Lord Keeper, married a Robert Sharpe of Bury St. Edmunds. (Metcalf, *Visitation of Suffolk 1561 etc.*, 1882.) "Cousin Sharpe" was almost certainly her son and therefore a true first cousin of Francis. ("Cousin" is often a vague term for almost any relationship.)

The letter quoted above was not known to Spedding. So far as I am aware it had not been printed before last year when it appeared in *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 196, No. 12 (9 June, 1951). The brother mentioned in the postscript is, of course, Anthony, Bacon's full brother. Let us hope he recovered his health and reached Cambridge in time for the feast on the buck with Francis and cousin Sharpe!

HOW BACON HELPED ESSEX WITH HIS PEN

By R. L. EAGLE

WHEN Essex wanted to make an impression with a letter to the Queen or King James VI of Scotland, he employed Francis Bacon to write for him.

The Northumberland Manuscript contains some examples of letters and speeches which Bacon wrote for noblemen whose abilities were not equal to or even comparable with, those of Bacon. We find, for instance, mention of:

Earle of Arundell's letter to the Queen
Speeches for my Lord of Essex at the tylt
Speech for my Lord of Sussex at the tylt

There is a letter written on 17th May, without mention of the year which was presumably 1594, signed by Essex's cipher "7" which was unquestionably written by Bacon, and not by Essex. It is printed in Birch's *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* extracted from the Lambeth MSS. There is no mistaking the style and tricks of phraseology. Essex was quite incapable of writing this:

Most gracious and renowned prince,

If I should only regard the weakness of mine own merit, without having an eye unto the exceeding bounty, whereby your majesty hath quickened me to make a present of all that service which my poor ability may perform, I should have forborne to have made this paper witness of my boldness. But in what manner could I have framed a plea in excuse of inexpressible ingratitude if I had not by some lines given a taste of the affections of my heart which breathe only after the prosperous success of a king of so much worth, whose servant I am born by nature, and by duty am obliged to exercise all the powers both of my mind and body in advancing his designs? Therefore, such as I am, and all whatsoever I am (tho' perhaps a subject of small price) I consecrate unto your regal throne; protesting that what defect may be incident unto me, it shall appear more fitly to be set on the score of error than of wilfulness. And whereas I have presumed, out of the suddenness of my brain, to hatch a rude and indigested piece of work, most humbly I beseech your Highness to overlook it with a favourable eye, and to conceive that I took in hand to play the statesman rather out of the zeal I bore to so just a cause, than out of any overweening honour of mine own sufficiency. Neither do I doubt that the minds of all my countrymen, being already in motion to betake themselves to a rightful cause, will jointly unite their hopes in your majesty's noble person as the only centre wherein our rest and happiness consist.

I refrain from presenting thanks in lieu of full payment, for I feel my forces unable to weigh with your highness's magnificence. Therefore, in this behalf I will imitate Timanthes who covered

those parts of his picture with a veil which he could not express lively by the art of his pencil, esteeming it more commendable to refer them to the imagination of others, than to bewray his own imperfections in colours.

In like sort while I want apt words to reveal the thoughts of my grateful heart, I am determined to shadow them with the veil of silence, until some happy revolution of time shall turn my inside outward, and give a public demonstration of my loyalty. In mean season, I please myself with this hope that, being unable to present more, your accustomed grace will accept of my good will which offers all that it can.

Your Majesty's most humble and affectionate servant,
"7"

The letter is in reply to one from King James to Essex concerning spying by Lord Zouch, ambassador to Scotland, and the gathering of secret intelligence from Earl Bothwell. James also wrote to the Queen on 13th April, 1594 on this subject.

There are many examples of letters which were actually composed and written by Essex. Any one of these would serve to show the marked inferiority between his own style and that quoted above. Here is one from Vol. VIII, fol. 119 of the Lambeth Manuscripts. It is addressed to Anthony Bacon:

Sir,

I am sorry for the mischance of the intercepting of Standen's letter, and I do wish that my Lord Treasurer would satisfy his request for Rolston. If my lord do it not, I will do what you will have me. I send you herewith a warrant for a buck in charity, one in Hyde Park, and another out of Waltham forest. I am infinitely grieved with your brother's sickness. I will see him as soon as I can get from hence; but my Lord Chamberlain and Mr. Vice-Chamberlain are both absent, and nobody here but myself. Commend me to him, I pray you; and so I commend you both to God's protection. In haste this Wednesday,

Your most assured friend,

ESSEX

Many other letters signed by Essex, and undoubtedly composed by him are to be found among the volumes at Lambeth, to which there is an index. Several of them are copied into Birch's *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (1753)—a most valuable book for any student of the period to possess. It is in two large volumes.

WHO WROTE THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS?

AN AIDE MEMOIRE TO LECTURERS AND YOUNGER STUDENTS

Why the Shakespeare Plays are pre-eminent in world literature.

It is universally admitted, to use the words of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, a famous Shakespearean scholar, "that the Plays and Poems known as Shakespeare's are the most wonderful product of the human mind which the world has ever seen, that they evince the ripest classical scholarship, the most perfect knowledge of the law, and the most intimate acquaintanceship with all the intricacies of the highest Court Life."

Why is it generally believed that these immortal works were written by William Shaksper of Stratford-on-Avon?

They bear the name of "Shakespeare," although the Stratfordian's name, in such legal documents as exist, was spelt variously as Shaksper, Shaxpur, or Shakspr. The author, in his earlier works, used the name with a hyphen, SHAKE-SPEARE, a reference to the Athenian goddess Pallas Athene, patroness of the fine arts.

Shaksper of Stratford went to London in 1586, and became associated with the Globe Theatre, where the Shakespeare Plays were produced.

In 1597, Shaksper quitted London and returned to Stratford, a comparatively wealthy man for that age. He traded as a maltster, bought land, and lent money.

When he died in 1616, some person or persons for a certain purpose set up a monument in Stratford Church, with a cryptic Latin inscription to "William Shakespeare." The original sculptured bust of a sour-faced individual with a drooping moustache and beard, his hands placed on a sack of produce, was removed in 1748, and the present one, with upturned moustache, holding a pen in one hand and his other on paper, was erected in its place.

In 1769, David Garrick, the actor, visited Stratford, and was the means of publicising the claim based on the monument that Shaksper, of Stratford, was the original Shakespeare. Since then large sums have been invested to establish the myth and identify the birthplace of the immortal poet. This has brought great wealth to the town.

Why Shaksper of Stratford could not have been the Author.

There is no evidence that he ever attended school. Few could read or write in his period.

It is doubtful if he could write his name. Of the six signatures extant all vary in writing and spelling and anyone may have been the work of lawyers' clerks.

His parents, likewise his two daughters, were all illiterate and unable to sign their names.

His will made no reference to the Plays.

There is nothing in his life to connect him in the slightest degree with learning or literature.

The erudite play of *Love's Labour's Lost* about Court Life in Navarre, reveals complete knowledge of French manners and customs, and is fully conversant with the atmosphere and intricacies of the Court of the King of France. It is dated as written in 1589, only three years

after young Shaksper went to London, penniless, and uneducated, to scrape up an existence.

It was impossible for a young man of no family, hailing from a small provincial town, the son of parents who could not write, within a short time after arrival in London, to possess an inner knowledge of royal courts, of the aristocracy, and of their language.

The Plays and Poems display a consummate knowledge of classic works of Greek and Latin writers, several of which had not been accessible then in England. This fact alone surely renders the authorship of Shaksper impossible.

Shakespeare's profound knowledge of the intricacies of the law has been the wonder of many of our greatest lawyers. Shaksper could have had no training or knowledge of legal lore.

The publication of the Shakespeare Plays began in 1597 and continued without a break until 1604. Shaksper had returned suddenly to Stratford in that same year 1597 and from thenceforward engaged in trade and money lending. The Stratfordians admit that he took no part in the publication of the Plays.

Many of the Plays, such as *Romeo and Juliet*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Winter's Tale*, and others, reveal inside knowledge of Italy and Italian laws and customs. Shaksper did not travel abroad.

Shaksper in his Will made no mention of the Plays and Manuscripts. When he died he did not possess a single book, or a copy of the various Plays and Poems then existing in quarto form.

Shaksper made no claim to be the author of the Plays or Poems.

Reasons why Francis Bacon is claimed as the author.

Francis Bacon, from the point of view of scholarship and prolific learning (at his death he was proclaimed as a "concealed poet"), is claimed as the author for a variety of reasons.

A great scholar, a master of Greek, Latin and Hebrew, and of French, Italian, and Spanish, he was educated in his earliest days by famous tutors, went to Cambridge University at twelve, and walked out of it disillusioned at fifteen, as it could teach him no more. He is admitted universally as one of the world's greatest scholars and philosophers.

While yet fifteen, he was sent by Queen Elizabeth to the Court of France and was maintained there. He stayed for some three years and returned to study the law, entering Gray's Inn. In later years he was special legal adviser to the Queen, and became Solicitor General in 1607, and later Lord Chancellor.

Nevertheless, from 1580, in his twentieth year, until the death of Elizabeth in 1603, he was mainly engrossed in literary labours, and was the head of a secret society of *litterati* called the Rosicrucians, whose aim was to spread knowledge and teach higher philosophy. He has been acclaimed as the father of the Renaissance. Among other tasks he largely created the modern English language.

Until 1597, when his Essays were published, nothing had appeared as written by himself, except for a few short official documents of a legal or political character. Yet from 1582 onward large numbers of books appeared, mostly in English, bearing mystic designs and symbols, Rosicrucian "trade-marks" in effect, as used in his own recognised works. They were published to educate, instil wider knowledge, and uplift mankind. In these labours Bacon impoverished himself and was frequently in financial straits.

He also used the stage as a medium of instruction for influencing the masses, though not openly. He was famed from an early age as the writer of elaborate masques performed before the Queen and the nobility, and the Benchers of Gray's Inn, etc.

He had the strongest personal reasons for keeping his authorship of the Shakespeare Plays anonymous, and for years no one was named as their author. His historical plays were educational, and dangerous when concerned with the aims and objects of kings and princes. One led to great trouble in 1597.

The Quarto Edition of the play *Richard II*, of 1597 was published with no acknowledged authorship. This play greatly angered the Queen. "I am Richard the Second—know ye not that?" she asked a courtier. "This tragedy was played forty times in open streets and playhouses." She regarded it as treasonable, as an incitement to her subjects to assassinate her as Richard II had been.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence⁽¹⁾ and others have shown that at this critical time, the Queen ordered the arrest of the author, who would probably have been tortured and executed. In this crisis, Shaksper, the actor, who had almost certainly been Bacon's secret agent ⁽²⁾ accepted the risk of posing as the playwright. He was given £1,000 and a few years later, the property of New Place at Stratford. The Earl of Southampton, then a close friend of Bacon, advanced the £1,000. Shaksper went into hiding until the hue and cry was over, and then set up in business at Stratford.

In 1598, the following year, a new edition of *Richard II* was published significantly as by "William Shake-speare." In this same year a booklet was published privately by the Rev. Francis Meres, M. A. entitled *Palladis Tauria or Wit's Tragedy*, in which many claim he indicated Francis Bacon as the real author of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, as well as his "sugared Sonnets."

From 1598 to 1616, the year Shaksper died, many new Shake-speare Plays were produced and printed. In 1623, seven years after his death, appeared the First Folio of Shakespeare, consisting of thirty-six plays, thirteen published only after his death and others never previously heard of. They were one and all written, produced, and published, quite independently of him.

It may be added that the Plays, like Bacon's admitted works, carry wonderful cyphers, which tell his personal life story and the secret of his birth, explaining why he could not avow his authorship in the reign of Elizabeth or in that of James I.

(1) *Bacon is Shakespeare* and other works.

(2) Bacon, in his Biliteral Cypher, in his Address to the Decipherer, speaking of his "masks," including Shakespeare, gives a clear indication of how he placed his plays through an agent, and paid for their production. He says, with reference to his play *Pericles*, "All men who write stage plays are held in contempt. For this reason none say, 'How strange' when a play cometh, accompanied with gold, asking a name by which one putting it forward shall not be recogniz'd, or thought to be cognisant of its existence. For this cause, if rare stories must have a hiding (place), no other could be so safe, for the men who had won gold in any way did not readily acquaint any man, least of these a stranger, with his source of wealth as you may well understand." (*Biliteral Cypher*, Mrs. Gallup's 3rd ed., p. 77). In other words, if Shaksper, armed with gold, offered a Shakespearean Play like *Pericles*, to a manager, together with a substantial payment, no questions were asked. Alfred Dodd says, with reference to this disclosure, "Contemporary writers like Greene and Nash, write bitterly about him (Shakespeare), not as a writer but as broker of plays, as a mask for someone else." (*Sonnet Diary*, pp. 197-198)

OBITUARY NOTICES

Mr. A. P. Godfrey

The Council announces with profound regret the death of Mr. A. P. Godfrey, at the beginning of October. Mr. Godfrey, although over seventy-five years of age, had rendered valuable services to the Society in recent years and had contributed to *BACONIANA*.

Equipped with a wide knowledge of the many-sided facets of the Baconian case, he always retained a refreshing enthusiasm in his endeavours to introduce the subject to sincere enquirers after the truth, and he was a staunch advocate of the Bi-literal Cypher, as members can discover for themselves by referring to his article "A Commentary on the Cyphers" printed in the Spring, 1951, issue of *BACONIANA*. The writer well remembers Mr. Godfrey's effective presentation of the Society's viewpoint in a debate with the Orthodox and Oxfordian exponents at the Royal Empire Society in November, 1950, and it had been hoped that his services would be enlisted again for outside lecturing.

Perhaps at this juncture we may quote Francis Bacon:

"He that dies in an earnest Pursuit, is like one that is wounded in hot Blood; who for the time, scarce feels the Hurt; and therefore, a Minde fixt, and bent upon somewhat that is good, doth avert the Dolours of *Death*: But above all, believe it, the sweetest Canticle is, *Nunc Dimittis*; when a Man hath attained worthy Ends and Expectations *Death* hath this also; That it openeth the Gate to good Fame and extinguisheth *Envie*."

Requiescat in pace

NOEL FERMOR

Mr. A. J. Hamerster

The Council also announces with great regret the death of Mr. A. J. Hamerster, who was well known to Baconians as the author (under the pen name of James Arther) of a book called *A Royal Romance* and of three booklets published under the title of *In Baconian Light*. We understand that he passed away at the Hague, Holland, in April, 1951.

The writer confesses that on first reading the preface to the Reader in *A Royal Romance*, which was published in Madras, India, in 1941, he was at once impressed by the deep religious understanding and gentle spirit of the author, who did not hesitate to pay tribute to "the inspiration, welling up from within", as the motive power behind the writing of the book. Yet he could hit hard in the cause of truth as he saw it—witness his opening sentences in the Introduction of this same book: "Bacon is Shakespeare. That was his glory, his triumph. But he is also Francis Tudor, son of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Leicester by a secret marriage and that was his bane, the

hidden cause of his disgrace." Arther was a staunch advocate of the Bi-literal and other ciphers and indeed he puts up a cogent case for "Bacon's Clock, Symbol and Anagram ciphers," illustrated with the results of his own painstaking research.

In view of the current controversy on the Bacon ciphers in the 1611 Bible, we must record that he was emphatically in favour of those who claim that Psalm 46 contains marks put there by the master-mind: but he adds—

"Some are certain to ask why Bacon should not have manipulated the texts of Joel and Isaiah in the same way as he has apparently done that of Psalm 46, so as to leave us in the other two books also a clear signature or mark of his handiwork. I have given the answer already; because of his reverence for the Book of God, which might permit him in one place, probably with very little manipulating, to leave his finger-print, but kept him from repeating the experiment elsewhere, when too much manipulating was probably needed.

"Besides, the cross-confirmation of anagram and clock-ciphers in the case of the Psalm gave such overwhelming proof, in my opinion, that this one case by itself may have seemed to Francis Bacon all-sufficient.

"For these reasons I cannot share the optimism of those who hope still to find many more similar indications of Bacon's workmanship in the black-letter Bible of 1611, except what the head-and-tail-pieces may teach us in this respect. But that is another story for another time."

"James Arther" did yeoman service to the Baconian cause and perhaps these extracts from the opening lines of the dedication to King James in the *Novum Organum* will not be out of place when we remember him.

"which books denote that he was engrafted on philosophy and philosophy on him and all . . who saw and read these works bear evidence to the same that they never have been able to write about those matters in such a way nor in better style."

N.F.

Editor's Note.—A member supplies the following biographical notes:

A. J. Hamerster was of Dutch nationality, and was born and died in Holland. At one time he held a Government post in Java, and was from 1933 to 1945 Treasurer of the Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras. Towards the end of his life he took the yellow robe and became a Bhiku. During the years he spent at the Theosophical Society he did much literary work, and wrote on philosophical subjects under the name of Aryasangha. He edited some of H. P. Blavatsky's papers. His wife predeceased him, but he leaves a daughter.

THE CHARACTER OF HAMLET

A new interpretation by Señor Salvador de Madariaga,
whose book *On Hamlet*¹ is reviewed

By HOWARD BRIDGEWATER

IT is I believe true to say that more books have been written on the play of *Hamlet* than about any other literary work in any language.

This is, of course, primarily due to its exceptional interest, its wonderful philosophical soliloquys, intriguing plot and constant action, as well as to its literary beauty. Yet unquestionably it is also, in large measure, due to the endeavour to reconcile the apparent inconsistencies in the character of the play's principal protagonist, whose conduct appears frequently to clash violently with the general conception of him as a high-minded gentleman distinguished (according, among others to Prof. A. C. Bradley) for "the peculiar beauty and nobility of his nature."

As one of the chief charms of "Shakespeare" is the clarity and consistency of his character delineations, it has baffled the wit of critics, of what is certainly one of his finest works, to account for this apparent failure to paint a consistent picture of its hero. Thus a very large number of the commentaries on *Hamlet* have been concerned to account for the varying moods of him whom (according to Prof. Dover Wilson) "Shakespeare loved above all other creatures of his brain."

Yet plausible as are these efforts to reconcile the contrariness of Hamlet's character they fail to satisfy. His gross rudeness to Ophelia is *not* justified by the circumstance that she acted as an innocent decoy in a legitimate enquiry concerning his state of mind: it is indeed especially ungallant if one assumes, as many do, that she had been his mistress. His attitude towards and final action against his erstwhile friends Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern, who know nothing of the contents of the letter they were to hand to the King of England, and who were so genuinely desirous of helping him ("Heaven make our presence and our practices pleasant and helpful to him") was unpardonable. And however desirous one may be to retain one's "gentlemanly" impression of Hamlet it is hardly possible to do so in face of his action in coldly dragging Polonius' body out of the room in which he has killed him, the while he upbraids him for "a rash intruding fool."

These are only some of the many instances of bad manners and callous inconsiderateness towards those who get, or even appear to get, in his way, that can be brought against this Prince of Denmark the "peculiar beauty and nobility" of whose nature we have been

¹Hollis and Carter, 1948.

urged to admire by one of the profoundest commentators on the immortal plays.

Now in the same way that it is humanly impossible to believe that the world's greatest literature was the work of the man of Stratford-on-Avon and the "authorship" difficulties disappear so soon as it is realised that his name was used to conceal the identity of the noble aristocrat who wrote it, so the true character of Hamlet can be understood only when it is appreciated—and this is the main theme of Señor Madariaga's book—that the only principle capable of giving an order of coherence thereto, the only explanation for all that he says or does, is that Hamlet was egocentric. That is the reason why so many of his actions give rise to interminable discussions so that the bias which will make of him a refined, sweet, generous gentleman, provides, as de Madariaga asserts, "no definite set of co-ordinates for them."

When we see that the centre of Hamlet's interest, thought, motive and emotion is himself, the play becomes clear "as the solar system after Copernicus, when astrologers were able at last to drop their cycles and epicycles and refer everything in simple ellipses to the sun."

In the light of this discovery, for it is no less than that, it will be seen that Hamlet acts only when his own interests are directly concerned. His apparent procrastination, generally considered to be his most mysterious feature, is seen to be due to the fact that its motives are sought where they cannot be found: it becomes clear that his inaction is the inevitable outcome of his self-centredness. He betrays no fastidious or instinctive repugnance to killing, for he kills Polonius and Laertes and in the end the King himself, and he quite cheerfully despatches Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern to their doom, though "two men there are not living to whom he more adheres"!

An especially striking example of Hamlet's ruthlessness is observable quite early in the play where, when obstructed in his determination to follow the ghost, he says:—

"Unhand me gentlemen,

By heaven I'll make a ghost of him that lets me."

As de Madariaga so cogently points out this is one of the key points in the drawing of his character, for it shows that when he has decided to do anything he will not hesitate to kill even his closest friend, for Horatio is one of the gentlemen whom he threatens, sword in hand.

As no review of a book should do more than explain its essential message and, happily, whet the appetite of readers to study it themselves, I will now close in the hope that I have done this: but not before venturing the prediction that this fascinating work "*On Hamlet*" will eventually result in a complete re-orientation of the accepted interpretation of the character of the Prince.

Salvador de Madariaga will be known to most of our readers as a member of the B.B.C. Brains Trust. It is not so generally known that he has broadcast every week for several years from London to Spanish America in Spanish, and on many occasions in French from

Paris and in German from Switzerland, on literary and political subjects. He was born in La Coruna, Spain, in 1886, and was educated mainly at Paris. Always inclined towards literary studies he devoted several years thereto in London from 1916 onwards. In 1912 he married Miss Constance Archibald, a Scotswoman, who was then translating a work by the well-known economist Chas. Gide.

He has written many books, including, notably, such biographical and historical works as his "Christopher Columbus" and "Hernan Cortes" and has translated *Hamlet* into Spanish. In 1927 he was offered a chair of Spanish literature at Oxford, where he divided his time between his professorship and further literary activities. In 1931 he was appointed to the post of Spanish Ambassador in Washington, and in the following year to Paris. Exigencies of space preclude more than this brief sketch of de Madariaga's achievements, adequately to chronicle which would require a whole issue of *BACONIANA*.

FREEMASONRY IN TUDOR ENGLAND

AN interesting field for conjecture is opened up by certain statements in William Preston's *Illustrations of Masonry* (1804). According to him, Henry VIII appointed Cardinal Wolsey as Grand Master of the Freemasons. Wolsey was followed by Thomas Cromwell; the Earl of Essex (Walter the 1st Earl); Lord Audley; Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset; John Poynt, Bishop of Winchester. After the King's death, Sackville was Grand Master until 1567. Then the north was taken by Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford; and the south by Sir Thomas Gresham. After Bedford's death, the north was held by Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham; and the south was taken after 1588 by George Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon.

Tradition (see the *Dictionary of National Biographies*) has always had it that Sackville was a Mason, but Preston seems to be the sole authority who claims that the Church and great nobles were actively interested in Freemasonry during and after the reign of Henry VIII. It is at once apparent that if we can accept his statements, or even a part of them, Freemasonry was a powerful force in England and included many possible patrons of literature. However, it is more logical to suppose that it allied itself with antiquarian researches and the building or preservation of public edifices. In fact, it is stated by Preston that William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke, went with Inigo Jones to Italy on antiquarian research. Both, he says, were Masons; and he says also that the Lodges were constituted on the model of the Italian seminaries of instruction. Apparently more research should be done with a view to finding out what were the relations of Freemasonry in Tudor and Jacobean England to antiquarianism, to the development of architecture, and in general to the bringing to England of Italian ideas and craftsmen. Tudor Freemasonry was cultural in its objects, and would have been very different in its ritual and ceremonies from what is known as modern Freemasonry which is a system of morality veiled in Allegory and illustrated by Symbols, and is founded on the principles of "brotherly Love, Relief and Truth."

R. L. EAGLE

THE WILL OF SIR NICHOLAS BACON

IT is not correct to suggest that the Lord Keeper made no provision for Francis in his will. The testator after leaving to his wife, Lady Anne, all his interest in York House continues: "I desire her to see to the well bringing-up of my two sons, Anthony and Francis, that are now left poor ophans without a father." He considered the bringing-up of Francis *was* the affair of himself and his wife. When Sir Nicholas made his will on 23rd December, 1578, Francis was still a minor. He was the youngest of five sons. It is curious that to Edward, the youngest son by his first wife, he leaves neither money, horses, lands nor goods, nor even any reversion.

The will may be inspected at Somerset House, but for the convenience of Baconian students, the following is a copy:

"In the name of God, Amen. The three and twentieth day in December in the year of our Lord God a thousand five hundred seventy and eight, and in the one and twentieth year of the reign of our Sovereign lady Elizabeth by the Grace of God Queen of England, France and Ireland. Defender of the Faith &c. I, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Knight Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, being of whole mind and memoriy do make this my present testament in manner and form following,¹ revoking all former wills and testaments made by me, before the date hereof.

"*First.* I commit my soul in the hands of Almighty God who of his omnipotency did create it, and of his infinite mercy redeemed it, and now as my undoubted hope is by the same merciful redemption, will glorify it and save it.

"My desire is to be buried at Paul's where my tomb is. And because I give no blacks (*i.e.* funeral gowns) to the rich that have no need therefore, I give to the poor that have need five hundred marks to be distributed according as by a schedule subscribed with my hand doth appear. I will notwithstanding blacks be given to my household folks both at London and Gorhambury, and to all my children their husbands and wives.

"*Item.* I give to my dear and well-beloved wife one thousand five hundred ounces of my plate whereof the one half gilt and the other half parcel-gilt and white, to be chosen by her out of all my plate except such parcels as I give away by special name.

"I give her also all my linen, napery, hangings, coaches, litters, and all other my household stuff and household store remaining at London except my ready money, plate and armour, and except such evidence as appertain to any lands or hereditaments as be assigned to any of my children by my former wife, and except such things as remain in my study, and such things as I give away by special words, requiring my wife in consideration of the same provision and store to keep so many of my household together at her charges during a month

¹*Costard.* "In manner and form following." (*Love's Labour's Lost*, 1 i)

after my death as will tarry so long for the better doing whereof I give her in ready money £100. I give her also such jewels and goldsmiths' work (except plate) as remaineth with her. I will also to my said wife all my horses and geldings. And also my interest in all my stocks of sheep going at Ingham or Tymworth or within any of my sheep courses there. To possess and use during her life upon condition that within one year next after my decease, and before her marriage again, she become bound to my executors in the sum of two hundred pounds that at the time of her death she shall leave to such person or persons as ought then to possess the same manor and stock of sheep going upon the same manor and within the same sheep courses of like goodness and of as great a number as she shall receive.

"And this is done because I am bound upon covenants of marriage of my eldest son to leave such a stock after the death of my said wife. And I will that the stocks letten with Stiffkey go as the lands is there appointed to go and remain. And I will that the one half of all the household stuff that shall remain at Gorhambury at the time of my death (except my plate, tent and pavilion) to Anthony at the age of 24 years. And if he die before then to Francis at the same age. And the other half I will to Anthony after the death of my wife. And in the meantime my wife to have the use of it. To whom also I give all my green store of household remaining either at Redbourn or Windridge and all my other goods and chattels remaining there (except my plate and money and other things before given or excepted).

"*Item.* I will that all my lease of Aldenham and all copyhold lands or tenements lying in the parishes of St. Michael or St. Stephens nigh St. Albans or joining to any lands of Westwick, Gorhambury or Praye shall remain and go according as my house of Gorhambury is appointed to go and remain.

"*Item.* I give to my said wife all my interest in York House in consideration of which legacies and in consideration of such assurances of manors, lands and tenements as I have assured unto my said wife, and for all loves that have been between us, I desire her to see to the well bringing-up of my two sons Anthony and Francis that are now left poor orphans without a father. And further I will bequeath to the said Anthony my son all that my lease and term of years and all my interest and demand which I have of or in all those woods commonly known or called by the name or names of Brittel-firth alias Brighteigh-firthe alias Brighteighe wood and Burnet Heath lying and behind the parish of St. Stephens in the county of Hertford. And also all that yearly rent of £26 13s. 4 due and payable for the said woods. And also all my right, title and possession which I have of and in any lands tenements and hereditaments assured to my said son Sir Nicholas for the true payment of the said rent of £26 13 4. And also all that my lease and term of years, and all my title and interest and demand which I have of or in the farm of Pinner Park lying in the parish of Harrow in the county of Middlesex. And also of and in all my other lands tenements and hereditaments lying in the said parish of Harrow. To have and to hold to the said Anthony the said woods lying within the

said parish of St. Stephens. And all the said farm called Pinner Park, and all the said lands and hereditaments in Harrow for and during so many years as it shall happen the said Anthony to live. And if it shall fortune the said Anthony to die before the full end and expiration or determination of the said leases and terms therein contained, then my will and intent is that the eldest son of the body of the said Anthony for the time being, and the heirs male of his body for the time being shall have, hold, occupy and enjoy successively during their several lives all the said woods and farm and other premises before bequeathed to the said Anthony for the time being, or the heirs male of the body of the said eldest son shall be severally and successively fortune to live, and if it fortune the said Anthony and his eldest son, and every of them to die without issue male of their bodies, and of the body of every of them before the full end and determination of the said leases and terms of years therein contained, then my will and full meaning is further that Francis my son shall have, hold, occupy and enjoy the said woods, farm and other premises before bequeathed to the said Anthony. To him the said Francis his executors and assigns for ever.

Item. I give also to my eldest son and his heirs all my farms in Mildenhall and of Langerfarm, and of the lands and tenements in Ilketeshall, and of my house in Silver Street that I have of the House of Westminster, and of my farm of Dullingham.

"And further I will to my said heir my tent and pavilion remaining at Gorhambury, and all my apparel, armour and weapon remaining either at Redgrave, or at any house in London, all my household stuff, stock, store and other goods remaining at Redgrave, and all things remaining in my study at London except such as be given away by special words.

Item. I give to Robert Blackman my nephew all my interest in the lease of the meadows and grounds at Ham.

"And to Nathaniel my son towards the building of his house at Stiffkey two hundred pounds, and besides all my lease of the lands in Stiffkey and my stock of sheep going upon them.

Item. I give to the Master and Fellows of Bennet College in Cambridge to the building of a chapel there £200.

"And I give to every one of my friends, and to my servants and such other persons as be named in a page hereafter following subscribed with my hand, all such things and sums of money as be in the same appointed.

"Provided always that if Anne my wife do not make or cause to be made within one year next after my decease, and before she be married again, to every of my sons, Nicholas, Nathaniel, Edward, Anthony and Francis, a sufficient release in law of all her right, title, interest and demands of dower of and in all the manors, lands, tenements and hereditaments whereof by reason of my seizin she is or then shall be dowable and deliver or cause to be delivered to every of my said sons, one such release within the said year and before she be married, then I will all my legacies, gifts and bequests to her made, shall be void, and then I will the same, together with the rest of my

goods, debts and chattels, after my debts paid, funerals discharged and legacies performed to my eldest son, Nicholas.

"Item. I will that the hundred pounds stock remaining with the Mayor of St. Albans and his brethren's hands for the setting of the poor of work be continued in their hands so long as they perform the covenants agreed upon between them and me, otherwise than my wife or heirs to Gorhambury receive and keep the same.

"And of this my will I make executors Sir Nicholas Bacon knight and Nathaniel Bacon, and overseer my Lord Treasurer my brother-in-law to whom I give a standing cup with a cover garnished with chrystal weighing 53 ounces 3 quarters, and to my Lady Burghley my sister-in-law a deep bowl with a cover having my cognizance weighing 21 ounces and a half.

"To Anthony my jewel that I wear, and to my daughter Bacon, my eldest son's wife, my chest in my study made by Albert, and my little box with rings, and to Mistress Butts my ring with the best turquoise.

"In witness whereof I have subscribed every page of this my will with mine own hand, and set to my seal the day and year first above written."

The spelling throughout is very quaint and as the will in its original spelling is at times difficult to read I have modernised it.

Rawley, in his very unsatisfactory outline of Bacon's life, which was published in 1667, states that he had heard of knowing persons that his father had collected a considerable sum of money to provide an income for Francis "who though he was the youngest yet he was not the lowest in his father's affection." Lady Anne speaks of Francis as being his father's first choice. But Rawley says that the purchase being unaccomplished at his father's death, Francis received no greater share "than his single part and portion of the money dividable amongst five brethren." It is certain that under the will of Sir Nicholas, Francis inherited Gorhambury and its contents on the death of Anthony. If Rawley is to be believed, the Queen did not provide funds for Francis for, he states, "Though she cheered him much with the bounty of her countenance, yet she never cheered him with the bounty of her hand."

R. L. EAGLE

NOTES AND QUERIES

The writer of this note having regard to the view held by many that Bacon was the author of Shelton's *Don Quixote* thought that there might possibly be some evidence that "Shelton" had drawn upon the phrase book compiled by Bacon under the title *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies*. Having taken Sir E. Durning-Lawrence's book "Bacon is Shakespeare" from the shelf he opened it by chance at page 241 where there is in an Appendix a reprint of the *Promus*. (This page is stated to correspond to the back of Folio 103 in the original MS.)

The reader's eye at once fell on the phrase "Warned and half-Armed." He seemed to remember that he had recently met such a phrase in Shelton, and so it proved to be. On the first page of Chap. XVII, Part 2, the Don says, "He that is warned is half-armed." Motteux' translation of this passage runs, "Forewarned, forearmed," which is the habitual form and was probably an exact translation from the Spanish. In any case, Shelton's use of this unusual form of the proverb is a strange coincidence.

It may be of interest to note that on the fifth page of the same chapter the author of "Shelton's" work almost anticipated a slang expression adopted by the R.A.F. in the last war, when Sancho Panza says that "with tears in his eyes he beseeched him to desist from that enterprise (of the lions) in comparison of which that of the Wind-Mills was cakebread, etc."

A reference to Motteux, shows that in his usually close translation of the Spanish, the expression used is "Children's play." This suggests this question. Which is more likely, that Shelton should translate the Spanish for "Child's play" into "Cakebread" or that a translator of Shelton's work coming on the unusual expression "Cakebread" in the English should render it by the term "Child's play" in the Spanish? The answer can hardly be in doubt.

R. L-D.

* * * *

READER'S QUERY

Does any reader know the title of the book, publisher and date, in which the well-known French author, Albert Feuillerat, dealt with the biliteral cipher as interpreted by Mrs. Gallup?

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *BACONIANA*
Sir,

BACON'S LICENCE TO TRAVEL

In an editorial note to my article (*BACONIANA*, Autumn 1951) various questions were raised arising from the licence granted jointly to Edward and Francis Bacon to travel beyond the seas for the space of three years. I now ask for a little space in which to reply, for this is a subject of great interest to Baconians. Some of the points made are new to me, and I can trace no evidence to support them—

1. The evidence as to the landing at Calais on 25th September, 1576, is to be found in the Record Office (Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1574-1577), and in a letter written by Sir Amias Paulet on that date from Calais addressed to Burleigh:

“being accompanied with an extraordinary number, whereof some have been recommended unto me by the Queen, some by other noblemen, only until their coming to Paris. The Queen’s ships as likewise the other barques appointed for me and my horses were forced to seek their security at Sandwich, when the wind did serve to have passed to France.”

2. By saying that “both” landed at Calais, I meant, as I mentioned, Edward and Francis. I did not suggest that Anthony travelled on this occasion. I know that he did not.

3. To make a change in the Ambassadorship meant a great amount of preparation both for the retiring Ambassador and for the newly appointed one. It was only right and fair to give the long notice.

4. Paulet was the ideal Ambassador for France. He was a fluent French linguist of strong Huguenot sympathies and family ties. Dr. Valentine Dale did not officially hand over to Paulet until the latter’s arrival in Paris. The Queen’s detailed instructions as to the proceedings are among the State Papers (Foreign) at the Record Office. Even the household goods and plate had to be checked by Paulet. There is no mention of Francis Bacon in her instructions to him.

5. It was stated that the tutor, Mr. Duncombe, was in the entourage of Paulet. There is no evidence of this. The first and only mention of Duncombe is in a letter from Paulet to Sir Nicholas Bacon in 1577 when Duncombe was sent from France to Gorhambury as the bearer of the letter: “I may not omit to commend unto your Lordship the honest, diligent, discreet and faithful service of this bearer, which deserveth very good acceptation, thinking him worthy of the government of your Lordship’s son, or of any gentleman in England of what degree so ever.” There is no evidence that Paulet had been Bacon’s French tutor, or was known to him prior to the voyage to France.

6. There was nothing significant in the use of the Queen’s ships for the conveyance of a high official and his suite. There was no regular ferry between France and England. On this occasion there was a convoy of ships armed against Spanish vessels which frequently passed between the Netherlands and Spain.

7. Where is the evidence of the story about Francis “kissing the Queen’s hand” before leaving? Was he the only one of the “extraordinary

number" who left at the same time who had this privilege? The licence proves that no special facilities or privileges were granted to Francis Bacon for his journey and residence in France, nor even that he was in the same ship as Paulet.

Yours faithfully,
R. L. EAGLE

27 Avenue Road,
Falmouth

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

THE "A" HEADPIECE ON SHELTON'S *DON QUIXOTE*
(1612)

Dr. Langdon-Down (BACONIANA, July 1952) suggests that the appearance of the light and dark 'A' device, reproduced on page 64, is of Baconian significance. This is not so, nor does it apply to any of the fourteen variations of the "A" which are common printers' ornaments, found on books between 1563 and 1641. These books are good, bad and indifferent.

The design at the head of the Author's Preface to the Reader, to which Dr. Langdon-Down calls attention, appeared as early as 1563 on a book printed at Naples. This was *De Furtivis Literarum Notis Vulgo* by Baptista Porta.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence reproduces this block on page 55 of "Bacon is Shakespeare," and gives the dates and titles of eight of the many books on which it appeared in England between 1584 and 1622. As usually happened with these printers' ornaments, they were transferred from printer to printer on death or retirement.

Some of the blocks were in use over long periods of time, and they must have been of excellent manufacture to have endured so. I have a copy of the comedies of Terence printed by John Legatt in 1641 with the identical headpiece over the translator's Preface. This is the design used on *Don Quixote* and which had been nearly sixty years in frequent use. If the blocks were renewed one would expect to find minute differences in the engraving, but I cannot detect any.

Yours faithfully,
PROSPERO

To the Editor of BACONIANA

A DESCENDANT OF SIR NICHOLAS BACON

Sir,

The writer recently, while in San Francisco, California, purchased a copy of BACONIANA and was quite interested in the article regarding the descendants of the Bacon family.

My mother, Ella Woodhouse, was a direct descendant of Henry Woodhouse, an immigrant to America previous to 1637, who was the son of Captain Henry Woodhouse, Governor of Bermuda 1623-1626, and grandson of Sir Henry Woodhouse of Waxham, Norfolk, his first wife being Anne Bacon, daughter of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper, by his first wife.

Yours truly,
M. DREXEL RUTHERFORD